

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2009. In this Office Action, the office rejected all pending claims. Herewith are presented amendments to the claims.

Amendments to Claims 1, 2, 12, 16, 18 in Response to Examiner's Objections

Claim 1 is amended to remove the language "at least one" referring to the "client-side application program". This modification is done to address the Examiner's objection that Applicant did not state that "all" application programs are run on the server farm. See Office Action at page 8. The language "at least one" was used to state that one or more applications can be executed on the server farm.

Nevertheless, the phrase "at least one" is removed because it apparently does not add to or delete from the intent of the Applicant. The claim language now recites "a client-side application program", which is to be construed as including more than one application programs executed on the server farm.

Because the objected language "at least one" referring to a client-side application program is modified to state "a client-side application program" in Claim 1, a corresponding change is also made to claims 2, 12, 16 & 18 to be consistent. Examiner is respectfully requested to review and enter this amendment. In light of this change and the arguments presented earlier, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to disregard Kikinis as related art.

Amendments to Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 is further amended to define that "one or more remotely located application execution servers" as a "server farm." This definition makes it easy for reference and understanding of the claim. Appropriate related grammatical changes are also made.

Independent claim 1, is further amended to add the following features.

said client computer is optionally adapted to transmit a signal to an application discovery server in order to discover a desired client-side application, said client-side application may be located on (or downloaded to) the server farm;

said client computer is optionally adapted to receive a signal from the discovered client-side application (a) to launch said discovered application, or (b) to connect to said discovered application, or (c) to reconnect to said discovered application;

No new matter is added as a result of the inserted text. Support for this feature is present in the Specification at Fig. 3 (server farm), ¶ 0191 (application discovery), ¶ 0244 (reconnection to an application), ¶ 0530 (launching a new application). Examiner is respectfully requested to examine and enter the amendment.

Amendment to Dependent Claims 2-15

Claim 2 is amended to incorporate the features from claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 15 and 37 (into claim 2). No new matter is added as a result of these changes. Claim 11 is canceled. Presently remaining claims 2 and 5-10 & 12 are dependent on independent claim 1 and are believed to be patentable as being dependent on an otherwise allowable claim.

Response to Rejection of Claim 16 based on Kikinis

The office action rejected independent claim 16 as being disclosed in Kikinis. However, it is believed that Kikinis does not disclose or render obvious independent claim 16, which is principally directed toward a “compound request” message. At the cited location, Col. 5, lines 34-44, Kikinis describes the following:

Computer 13 has a CPU 25, a memory 27, video adapter circuitry 29, and modem 17 all communicating on bus 31. Video circuitry 29 drives a display 33. Memory 27 may be any of a number of types, such as flash, random access (RAM), read-only (ROM) or similar type, or a combination of these. There may be other components as well, but these are not shown to facilitate description of the unique aspects of this embodiment of the invention. The hardware arrangement is intentionally shown as general, and is meant to represent a broad variety of architectures, which depend on the particular computing device used.

Nothing in the cited language or in Figure 2 of Kikinis is any mention of a “compound request” of the type disclosed and claimed in claim 16 in the instant application. The general language of Kikinis that a variety of architectures would be used is to be read as indefinite rather than any specific technological disclosure meant to cover the specific “compound request” which is disclosed and claimed in the instant application. In order to make it clear, however, applicant has added the term “cache” to describe the compound request. This language or concept is not present in Kikinis. This does not add new matter. See, e.g., Summary of the Invention, at ¶ 0035. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendment to Independent Claim 16

Independent claim 16 is amended similarly to Claim 1 to define that “one or more remotely located application execution servers” as a “server farm” for the same reasons given above. Claim 16 is also amended to replace the phrase --without the need for an execution environment-- with the phrase “thereby obviating the need for a browser” in order to clearly explain that there was no requirement for a browser program to execute on the client computer. This modification clearly distinguishes this claim from Kikinis in that Kikinis requires a Nano Browser on the client computer in order to interpret the HT-Lite code that is downloaded from Kikinis’ Proxy Server. Claim 16 is further amended to delete the term “wide-area” that qualifies the mobile network. No new matter is added as a result of these changes. Examiner is requested to review and enter the amendments.

Amendment to Claims 16-28

Claim 18 is amended to incorporate the features from claims 17, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 37 into claim 18. Claims 17, 25, 26, 27 and 28 are canceled. Claim 23 is also canceled. Claim 29 is canceled previously. No new matter is added as a result of these changes.

Claims 18-22 & 24 are dependent on independent claim 16 and are believed to be allowable in light of the argument that Claim 16 is allowable.

Claim 29 is previously canceled.

Argument regarding claim 24

The Office Action argues that the term “cached drawables” specified in claim 24 were anticipated by the reference to “caching functions” in column 2, lines 54-59 of Kikinis disclosure. But this is not correct. In instant claim 24 the “cached drawables” were to be transmitted from the client to an active application on the server. Kikinis, to the contrary, describes a Proxy Server caching functions on the server side. Where the caching is done is material to claim 24. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Amendments to Claims 30-36

Claims 30-37 are amended to recite the method steps being claimed as computer program embodied on a computer readable medium for use with a computer executing the steps. The claims which depend on Claim 30 are also amended accordingly to avoid a mention of non-statutory subject matter. As they are now amended, the claims are believed to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 objection.

Claims 30 & 32-36 are also amended to recite the features “discovering” an application on a discovery server, and “launching or reconnecting to” the discovered application executing on a server farm. The term “server farm” is now used to describe what used to describe “server computer” in order to more clearly recite the different servers that are described in the application. No new matter is added as a result of the changed text. Support for this feature is present in the Specification at Fig. 3 (server farm), ¶ 0191 (application discovery), ¶ 0244 (reconnection to an application), ¶ 0530 (launching a new application). Examiner is respectfully requested to examine and enter the amendment.

Claims 31 and 37 are canceled in this amendment.

Conclusion

After the cancellations, only 22 claims including 3 independent claims remain for further examination. All pending claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art. In light of the

arguments, an early allowance is requested. A check in the amount of \$457 toward fee for the RCE is enclosed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: February 8, 2010

S/Naren Chaganti (44,602)
Naren Chaganti
713 The Hamptons Lane,
Town & Country, MO 63017
(650) 248-7011 phone
E-mail

Attorney for Applicant

Certificate of Mailing

I certify that on the date shown below I mailed this paper to:
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: February 8, 2010

S/Naren Chaganti (44,602)
Naren Chaganti